

Office de la propriété  
intellectuelle  
du Canada

Un organisme  
d'Industrie Canada  
www.opic.gc.ca

Canadian  
Intellectual Property  
Office

An Agency of  
Industry Canada  
www.cipo.gc.ca

RECEIVED  
MAY 14 A 9:51

May 11, 2004

**KIRBY EADES GALE BAKER**

Box 3432  
Station D  
OTTAWA Ontario  
K1P 6N9

**Application No.** : **2,335,210**  
**Owner** : HITACHI, LTD.  
**Title** : **ANSWER SYSTEM FOR TECHNICAL SUPPORT, AND  
TECHNICAL SUPPORT METHOD**  
**Classification** : G06F-17/30  
**Your File No.** : **46022**  
**Examiner** : R. Collier

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED OF A REQUISITION BY THE EXAMINER IN ACCORDANCE  
WITH SUBSECTION 30(2) OF THE *PATENT RULES*. IN ORDER TO AVOID ABANDONMENT  
UNDER PARAGRAPH 73(1)(A) OF THE *PATENT ACT*, A WRITTEN REPLY MUST BE  
RECEIVED WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER THE ABOVE DATE.

This application has been examined as originally filed.

The number of claims in this application is 21.

A search of the prior art has revealed the following:

**References Applied:**

United States Patents

5,793,964	August 11, 1998	G06F 115/00	Rogers et al.
5,870,562	February 9, 1999	G06F 15/16	Butman et al.

Canada

OPIC  CIPO

Rogers et al. teach a web browser system.

Butman et al. teach a universal domain routing and publication control system.

### **Lack of Patentable Subject Matter**

The claims on file are directed on non-patentable subject matter.

The disclosed technical support answer system requires substantial, non-trivial human interaction to operate. The basis of the system is to allow an expert to provide answers to client inquiries. Subject matter that depends on the professional skill of an individual is not patentable.

Furthermore, this system does not amount to a contribution or addition to the cumulative wisdom with respect to existing communication networks. The system described in this application uses common existing devices such as servers, databases, and firewalls. This does not amount to a new and innovative system and is therefore not patentable subject matter.

Therefore claims 1-21 fail to describe any patentable subject matter and therefore do not comply with Section 2 of the Patent Act.

### **Obviousness**

#### Claim 1

This claim describes a technical support answer system comprising web and mail servers, a database, a firewall, an input unit, and an intranet.

These are all standard network devices. All of these devices can be found in the systems taught by Rogers et al. and Butman et al.. The system of the subject claim is a generic network and is obvious in view of the teachings of the cited references and common knowledge in the art.

Claims 1-6 and 8-21 do not introduce any inventive subject matter.

In summary, claims 1-21 are obvious in view of Rogers et al., Butman et al., and common knowledge of the art and therefore does not comply with Section 28.3 of the Patent Act.

### **Indefiniteness**

#### Claim 19

This claim begins as follows: " A technical support according to claim 16...". This should read " A technical support **method** according to claim 16...".

This also applies to claim 20.

In summary, claims 19 and 20 are indefinite and do not comply with Section 27(4) of the Patent Act.

In view of the foregoing defects, the applicant is requisitioned, under Subsection 30(2) of the Patent Rules, to amend the application in order to comply with the Patent Act and the Patent Rules or to provide arguments as to why the application does comply.

Under Section 34 of the Patent Rules, any amendment made in response to this requisition must be accompanied by a statement explaining the nature thereof, and how it overcomes each of the above objections.

R. Collier  
Patent Examiner  
819-956-9812